

radiant image of what their life could be if it were permitted.

The truth is that West Berlin is a city of light and determination.

But Soviet Prime Minister Khrushchev is not willing to look upon West Berlin as a challenge which he will take up and eagerly endeavor to surpass.

Instead, West Berlin's freedom and resilience and prosperity are a "bone in his throat," an abnormality which he must try to suffocate.

I feel sure the West Berliners are not going to stand quietly by and have their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness suppressed. They will defend their postwar democracy with everything they own including their bare hands.

To travel by air to Berlin at night is an exciting experience. For 110 miles you have been flying over East German Communist territory and in every direction there is almost unrelieved darkness, occasionally a lone flicker of light to suggest a sleeping city—a kind of mental darkness as well as visible.

And then you come upon West Berlin as though a massive rainbow had burst through the clouds, a flashing, animate, multicolored city spread out below you as though proud to be alive and proud to be seen.

You can theorize all you want to about how West Berlin—a divided city in a divided country, a city surrounded by a regime controlled by Moscow—cannot last. You can look at the facts and say that this city can't exist, can't survive, can't sustain itself.

You can believe that West Berlin can surmount the latest Soviet-inspired crisis, but can it survive the next? Or the next? And you can logically conclude that West Berlin just is not tenable.

West Berlin has never been logically tenable but West Berliners have made West Berlin a great, a vibrant city of freedom, and made it tenable against all logic.

Some suggest that West Berlin is a dying city. It isn't. Because of the high percentage of elderly people in the city's total population, its population decreased 18,000 last year. Deaths still exceed births. But the birth rate is steadily going up. It mounted from 7.9 to 9.5 in the last 4 years. This measures the confidence of West Berlin youth in their future.

If there is one thing which the Western Powers must preserve it is the freedom of the 2,250,000 West Berliners who are using that freedom so magnificently.

HUMPHREY LAUDS WEST BERLIN AS "WHITE LIGHT OF FREEDOM" IN COMMUNIST DARKNESS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, told a gathering of the Minnesota Volkfest Association in Minneapolis Sunday that Khrushchev's "passionate resentment of the fact of West Berlin's independence stems from his fear that the white light of freedom streaming into the surrounding Communist darkness from West Berlin will keep all of Eastern Europe in a constant agitation for something better than the Communist can give them."

The Minnesotan, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told the group that he expected "renewed pressure on the United States and our allies" from the Communists to get out of West Berlin.

"We must have strong nerves and firm courage," he said, "the kind which the West Berliners themselves and their gallant mayor, Willy Brandt, have been displaying for so many years."

"Khrushchev has complained that West Berlin is a bone in his throat," Senator HUMPHREY commented. "What he really means is that West Berlin is a dazzling light that gets in the Russian eye. He doesn't

like it, and I don't blame him: West Berlin as an island of freedom and prosperity is a psychological threat to the whole edifice of Communist power in Eastern Europe.

"I must confess that I am worried, however, about what plans our Government may have for dealing with any new crisis on West Berlin that Khrushchev may bring about at any time."

"After more than 18 months since I was in Berlin with Willy Brandt at the time of the last great Berlin crisis, I am not convinced that our Government has made any concrete, workable plan for dealing with the next crisis—just as there were not workable plans for dealing with the U-2 incident and the summit collapse.

"Indeed, in those 18 months, Communist military power as compared with our own has been strengthened, and Khrushchev's arrogance and threats have increased proportionately.

"We cannot permit ourselves to stumble and falter if we are again faced with the next naked threat to the Western position in Berlin. We must not only have definite plans to deal with the crisis, but we must be sure that the Soviet dictatorship understands very clearly that the United States and our allies will take firm and definite steps to protect the freedom-loving West Berliners.

"There must not be another humiliating disaster to the West like that which we have just experienced."

Senator HUMPHREY recalled his visit with Mayor Brandt of West Berlin in November of 1958, when the Minnesotan flew directly to Berlin to assure the West Berliners that the American people backed them to the hilt in the face of the Khrushchev ultimatum.

"I remember as if it were yesterday how warmly Mayor Brandt welcomed me and with what pride he showed me his half of the city—from its bustling shops and factories to its modern housing for workers. He told me how all this had been raised from rubble—rubble so tremendous that it has been piled into landscaped and terraced hills and made into public parks.

"In long and frank talks as we drove about the city, he shared with me the grave problems in maintaining this little island of freedom in a totalitarian sea. At the heart of the city, by the famous Brandenburg Gate, we stood together on the very frontier between freedom and slavery.

"I was deeply moved as he told me of the hardships of the first Berlin blockade, and expressed the gratitude of his people for the Allied airlift which kept the city alive. The people of Berlin have put up a beautiful memorial directly in front of Tempelhof Airport to the 38 flyers who lost their lives in the course of the airlift, and I was privileged to lay a wreath before it.

"I spoke to many Berliners, and asked them how their nerves were standing up under the strain. They told me: 'Don't worry about our nerves, and we won't worry about yours.'"

"That is the spirit that characterizes the brave people of West Berlin," Senator HUMPHREY concluded. "To abandon them to the tyranny of the Communists would not only be morally evil, but it could be the first step in the erosion of American freedom itself."

"The Communist tiger would not be appeased by feeding him the bone of West Berlin—his appetite would only be sharpened for bigger game."

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, RADIO STATION WISN, MILWAUKEE, WIS., MARCH 6, 1960

It is only 10 weeks until the opening of the summit conference at Geneva. It is 18 months since Khrushchev launched his ultimatum against the freedom-loving city of

Berlin, and he is losing no opportunity to show his impatience. He very badly wants to push the West—and freedom—out of Berlin.

Even during his junket to Indonesia, he took time to threaten Berlin again. He demanded that the Western Powers sign peace treaties with both Germanies—West Germany and East Germany. If they did not, he threatened to sign his own treaty with East Germany, and to snuff out the legal rights of the occupying powers in Berlin.

"West Berlin," he said ominously, "is on the territory of East Germany."

The 1958 ultimatum has already yielded big dividends to Khrushchev—two Foreign Ministers' conferences, his visit to America, and an invitation to a series of summit meetings. But the appetite grows with eating, and he wants more and more and more.

At his press conference last month, Secretary of State Herter acknowledged that the tough Soviet talk on Berlin has him worried. With a frankness so far unique among administration leaders, he attributed it to the edge the Soviet Union now holds over the United States in intercontinental missiles—the so-called missile gap.

This raises a very grave question—what have we done with the 16 months since Khrushchev launched his warning?

One thing we certainly cannot complain of—the attitude of the free people of West Berlin. Under the leadership of their gallant mayor, Willy Brandt—a man whom I am proud to number among my close friends—they have remained steadfast in the face of a long series of veiled and naked threats.

I was in Europe in 1958 when the Khrushchev ultimatum was delivered, and I went direct to Berlin to assure its mayor and people that the American people backed them to the hilt.

I remember as if it were yesterday how warmly Mayor Brandt welcomed me and with what pride he showed me his half of the city—from its bustling shops and factories to its modern housing for workers. He told me how all this had been raised from rubble—rubble so tremendous that it has been piled into landscaped and terraced hills and made into public parks.

In long and frank talks as we drove about the city, he shared with me the grave problems in maintaining this little island of freedom in a totalitarian sea. At the heart of the city, by the famous Brandenburg Gate, we stood together on the very frontier between freedom and slavery.

I was deeply moved as he told me of the hardships of the first Berlin blockade, and expressed the gratitude of his people for the Allied airlift which kept the city alive. The people of Berlin have put up a beautiful memorial in front of Tempelhof Airport to the 38 flyers who lost their lives in the course of the airlift, and I was privileged to lay a wreath before it.

I spoke to many Berliners, and asked them how their nerves were standing up under the strain. They told me: "Don't worry about our nerves, and we won't worry about yours."

I don't worry about our nerves—but I do worry about the yawning gaps in our readiness to meet a crisis which may burst upon us in 10 weeks time—or even sooner.

I am concerned, as many well-informed observers are, about the space gap and the missile gap.

Soviet sputniks and luniks are blazing out into space with a magnitude of thrust which, even now—2 years after the first sputnik—we are unable to match.

I am alarmed by the prospect that, within the next 2 or 3 years, the Russians may have a 3-to-1 advantage over us in missiles—but I am even more alarmed that the administration reacts to this appalling prospect as if it were nothing more than the Russian victory in the winter Olympics.

It is the complacency gap which troubles me even more than the missile gap.

When I was in college, we were taught in elementary psychology that a stimulus gives rise to a response. This administration, however, has repealed the basic laws of human behavior. There is plenty of stimulus, but tragically little response.

We have been warned—again and again and again. But all this administration does is to administer us another tranquilizing pill.

There is another gaping gap that bothers me—what I call the testimony gap, the gap between what we are told and what we uncomfortably suspect to be the painful truth.

Recently we were told, in an official manual that shall remain nameless—and, in fact, unsanctified—that the idea of Americans having a right to know what's going on is, and I quote, "Another foolish remark often heard."

The manual has been shot down, but the malady lingers on. Only a few days ago the President blasted two of our most responsible newspapers—the New York Times and the Washington Post—for printing perfectly accurate reports of the testimony of former Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett—a Republican, by the way.

I for one shall keep repeating this so-called foolish remark until someone up there hears and heeds—and lets the American people know what's going on.

Who are we fooling, anyway? Maybe our own people—but not, by Secretary Herter's admission, the Soviets.

Then there is a third threatening gap—the moral gap, the gap between what we preach and what we practice.

Almost 6 years have passed since the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregated schools. Yet the administration and Congress still shirk their share of responsibility for enforcing that decision.

We haven't even heard from the White House what we have every right to expect—a clear and unequivocal affirmation of the moral rightness of that historic decision.

We talk of our affluent society—and yet we leave over 20 million of our people languishing in poverty: the aged, the sick, and those marooned in the depressed areas which pockmark our country.

Khrushchev doesn't need a "seeing eye" satellite to spy out our weaknesses. As he sees it, ours is a dying system—and his hands are itching for the spade so that he can "bury" us—to quote his own blunt word.

There isn't any quizmaster who can slip us, under the table, the answers to the grave questions which hang over us. There isn't any payola that will insure our prestige in the world, unless we earn it by deeds as well as words.

I have made a pretty careful study of Soviet strategy, and I know this. There is no day-to-day fumbling in their policy, as there too often is in ours. They think in terms of years and of decades. They weigh future trends as well as present facts.

They will have one kind of policy if they think America is rising in the world. They will have another, and much more unpleasant one, if they see we are sinking.

They will be watching what we do, listening to what we say, in the coming weeks. They will form their own shrewd judgment about whether we will continue sleepwalking into the limbo of second-class powers or whether we will, at long last, wake up and rally our great energies and capabilities for the crisis that lies ahead.

It is good that we have all—Democrats and Republicans alike—united to say we will stand firm on Berlin. But we must do more than say the right words—much more. We must move to close the gaps that cloud with doubt the firmness of our purpose.

I have just heard that Mayor Brandt has canceled plans to visit America and put the case of his beleaguered city before us—because of the renewed gravity of the situation there.

He wants to be on the job 24 hours a day, to meet and to cope with whatever may come. I would to God that our own Government had been on the job 24 hours a day for all these wasted 7 years.

For myself, I shall continue to blow the bugle, sound the warning, seek to awaken the American people to the peril in which they stand. Given the full facts and alert, on-the-job leadership, we shall, I am utterly confident, surmount this coming crisis.

Restoration of Freedom to Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am proud to insert the report submitted recently by Alexander Melnychenko, president of the executive committee of the Ukrainian National Council, local branch, Minnesota, regarding the restoration of freedom to captive nations.

I have many fine and loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent in the Third Congressional District of Minnesota, and this report of Mr. Melnychenko embodies their hopes and prayers that the leaders of our great Nation will never cease their efforts to bring peace and freedom—America's priceless heritage—to those behind the Iron Curtain:

RESTORATION OF FREEDOM TO CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Report sent by the Ukrainian National Council, local executive committee, Minneapolis, Minn., to the following members of the U.S. Government on June 7, 1960: The President of the United States of America, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Vice President of the United States of America, Richard Nixon; the Secretary of the Department of State, Christian A. Herter; the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge; the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.; the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.; the Ukrainian National Council-Ukrainian Government office in exile in Munich, West Germany; the President of the Ukrainian National Democratic Republic in exile, Dr. Stephan Wytwytsky; and the Ukrainian Democratic News Agencies-Press in United States and Europe.)

The members of the Ukrainian National Council, local executive committee, of the State of Minnesota takes the liberty of asking you to bring the following to the notice of the Representative to the United Nations and representative in the Security Council, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge.

Our people, who make up about 45 million of the population of the Soviet Union, have been conquered and incorporated in the imperialistic Russian empire at various times.

In the course of the 1917 revolution Ukraine was separated from Russia and formed its own republic, whose independence was recognized de facto by many governments, while a number of powers, including the Soviet Union, recognized them de jure.

In spite of this, the Soviet imperialistic

government had scarcely seized the territory of Russia proper during the civil war when it treacherously turned its weapon against our country and many others, conquered them one after the other.

The legitimately elected democratic parliaments and governments of our democratic national republic were liquidated. The deputies to the parliaments and the ministers were executed or deported. The same cruel fate befell the men of science and the national intelligentsia, as well as wide circles of the population of the republics conquered by the unhuman and despotic Soviet Government.

Religion was proclaimed "an opiate of the people" and was profaned. Churches, mosques, Buddhist temples, and Jewish synagogues were destroyed or turned into clubs, warehouses, or places of entertainment while priests of all denominations were either killed or deported to slave labor camps in Siberia.

All the conquered republics were subordinated to the central organs in Moscow and Sovietized. Millions of innocent peasants and workers of our country perished owing to Red terror during compulsory collectivization, during the famine which was artificially created by the Soviet Government, under the butcher Khrushchev, and during all kinds of purges, resettlements, and deportations, which are still continuing. The numbers of all prisoners in the concentration camps is beyond all calculation.

The dictatorship, which is carried out officially by the Communist Party, but in actual fact by only a few members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, continues undeviatingly its work of destruction, whose objective it is to spread communism and to seize power throughout the world.

Democracy, personal and national immunity, freedom of religion and of the press are not recognized in the Soviet despotic empire. Parliaments as the supreme legislative organ does not exist. Only in 1944 in some of these republics and autonomous territories more than 8 million people were wiped out with a stroke of the pen.

These crimes of the Soviet Government were at long last admitted by Khrushchev in his speech at the closed session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow on February 24 and 25, 1956. And yet Soviet despot Khrushchev was not ashamed to assert in the same speech that "the U.S.S.R. is considered a model multinational state, because we have insured in practice the equality and friendship of all the people who live in our great homeland."

Problems of such vital importance as the liquidation of a series of republics and peoples are not discussed by the Supreme Soviet, which is only a pretense of a parliament in the U.S.S.R. but by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Was the question of the genocide and the liquidation of the republics and territories discussed by the Supreme Soviet or by one of its two chambers? How did they defend the national peculiarities of the peoples, and how did the remaining deputies to the Supreme Soviet react to this crime? And finally, how did Soviet justice react to this heinous crime?

The answer is: There is no justice in Communist state.

We request the authority of the U.S. Government and our American representative to the United Nations and all the representatives of the democratic nations to the United Nations to ask the Soviet representatives what they have done, as members of the Soviet Government, to prevent the above-mentioned crimes, what they have done to have the millions of deported and imprisoned people returned to their native soil?

We all know that there will be no answer from Soviet butchers.

We testify to the fact that there is no parliament in the U.S.S.R. There are no free elections; freely elected nor a freely acting parliaments, being completely at the beck and call of the so-called collective leadership. The deputies to the Supreme Soviet are not freely elected representatives of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., they are individuals nominated by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Deprived of no chance to realize their legitimate rights and their will, our peoples are compelled to resort to the only means at their disposal; that is, to revolt against Soviet despotism, which is evidenced by frequent uprising, in the Ukraine, in the Cossack territory, in the Caucasus, Turkestan, and in the Byelorussia. These uprisings, however, are fiercely suppressed by Soviet military might and even poison gas.

We take the liberty of drawing the attention of the people of the United States, of the members of the U.S. Government, of the representatives of the democratic nations to the United Nations and its governments, to the fact that all contact with the Communist pseudoparliaments strengthens the Kremlin dictators, who claim to the people throughout the world that they are the champions of all enslaved peoples and that they are against colonial oppression, while they themselves are subjecting our peoples to unprecedented oppression, terror, and eradication.

The fraudulent slogan of coexistence, which is being advanced by Moscow, is completely unfounded in the presence of a totalitarian U.S.S.R., which fact is testified to by constant opposition of our peoples and our countries, and the countries of the so-called people's democracies. Driven to despair by the Moscow dictatorship's cruelty, they are forced to demand their freedom insistently, a fact which is eloquently manifested by recent events in south Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other countries beyond the Iron Curtain.

Let us all beware of Communist slavery. Let us all stand firm and united against any Communist movement to enslave the whole world.

Let us all have in minds about the "Restoration of Freedoms to Captive Nations."

We, American citizens of Ukrainian descent of the State of Minnesota, and as members of the Ukrainian National Council, local branch, of State of Minnesota, hope and pray that the members of the Government of the United States and the representatives of all democratic nations to the United Nations will strongly support our aspirations.

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER MELNYCHENKO,

President of the Council,

Federal Fishing Stamp Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the country, constructive efforts are underway by State conservation departments, as well as by conservation-minded individuals and groups, to preserve, conserve and, if possible, expand our fish and other wildlife resources.

Wisconsin, particularly, has carried forward realistic, well-designed, expansive programs in this field.

We recognize, of course, that traditionally, States have been hard pressed to find funds to carry forward such much-needed conservation programs. Nevertheless, the States have zealously—and rightly, I believe—guarded against unnecessary encroachment by the Federal Government.

Currently, there is pending before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in the House of Representatives, a bill, H.R. 11410, which, among other things, would authorize the issuance of a Federal fishing stamp.

The purchase of such a stamp—appended to a resident license—would permit fishing in national park areas elsewhere in the country.

In addition, the provision would authorize two or more States to form a compact, under the following provisions:

First. Agree to recognize Federal-State fishing licenses and stamps.

Second. Agree on a uniform fee.

Third. Agree on an "equitable" formula for the allocation to the States which are parties to the compact of amounts from the sale of Federal-State fishing stamps.

Fourth. Agree not to subject the holder of a Federal-State fishing stamp to any requirement not applicable to the holder of a resident sports fishing license.

The measure would further provide for a compact between 10 or more States, in conjunction with the Secretary of Interior, for entering into agreements on recognition of fishing privileges.

Among other things, the compact would provide:

First. The proceeds would be paid into a special fund of the U.S. Treasury.

Second. After payment of all overhead, the Secretary of the Interior would prorate funds back to the parties of the compact.

Third. Not to exceed 10 percent of the moneys placed in the fund would be available to the Secretary of the Interior in any one year to promote fishing in national parks.

Fourth. The holder of a resident sports fishing license with a Federal fishing stamp attached could legally fish in all national parks, and, if his or her State were a party to the compact, in all waters of States in the compact.

Recently, I received a message from Lester P. Voigt, conservation director of the State of Wisconsin, expressing strong opposition to the objectives of H.R. 11410.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the points outlined in Mr. Voigt's letter, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, May 20, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U. S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Bill H.R. 11410 which is to be cited as the Federal Fishing Stamp Act has come to our attention.

Under title I of the bill, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue a Federal fishing stamp, the net proceeds of which, after deduction of expenses by the Postmas-

ter General, would go into the Federal fishing stamp fund and would be made available for use by the Secretary of the Interior in promoting fishing within the national parks. The Federal fishing stamp would have to be purchased and attached to the resident fishing license within 10 days after the purchase of the latter. The holder would then be entitled to fish in any national park without payment of any additional fee.

Title II of the bill gives the consent of Congress to the States to enter into compacts for the purpose of establishing and providing uniform nonresident fishing licenses. The Secretary of the Interior would issue a Federal-State fishing stamp to be sold at a uniform fee and attached to the resident fishing license issued by the State of residence of the holder. The holder would then be permitted to fish in any member State to the compact, and also to fish in any national park without the payment of any further fee. Not more than 10 percent of the revenue would be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for promotion of fishing in the national parks. The net proceeds from the sale of the Federal-State fishing stamps would be allocated to the member States on the basis of a formula agreed upon by the States in the compact.

The State of Wisconsin has consistently taken the position that proposals such as this are an encroachment on the rights of several States in that the legal title to, and the custody and protection of all wild animals, including fish within the State, is vested in the State for the purpose of regulating the enjoyment, use, disposition, and conservation thereof, and that the Federal Government has no authority to impose a system of fishing license fees or charges for the privilege of fishing in the public waters of the respective States. Further, this measure is a dangerous and unprecedented invasion of the traditional revenue source of the State in the management of its native fish populations.

The States may presently enter into compacts subject only to the approval of the Congress to the compact and this measure is not required to achieve interstate license reciprocity. The proposal would without question prove most costly to the State of Wisconsin from the standpoint of reduced revenues since we are the favored vacation State in the Great Lakes region by reason of our location, climate, scenery, and water attractions and the natural result of a reciprocity arrangement such as this would be that residents of other States would be allowed to enjoy Wisconsin's fishing advantages whereas residents of Wisconsin could not expect to avail themselves of similar advantages in other States where comparable fishing opportunities do not exist.

The State of Wisconsin has for a number of years sold more nonresident fishing licenses annually than any other State in the Union. Our State is favored with a multitude of lakes and streams that provide good fishing and the management of our fishery resource for sport fishing is nationally recognized as being outstanding. A large part from the revenues obtained as a result of the sale of such nonresident fishing licenses is necessary to maintain our fish management and law enforcement programs.

We believe that H.R. 11410 should be vigorously opposed and toward that end, we urge that your office express the opposition of the State of Wisconsin. We feel very strongly that enactment of this bill would seriously affect our income and cause us to reduce our programs materially. As you may know we recently found it necessary to adopt an austerity program because of increased costs and a drop in income. Further reduction in our program would really spell disaster.

A4914

If there is any further information that we can furnish, we will be most happy to do so.

Very truly yours,

L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

Scientists and Conflicts of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

of Michigan
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, recently, Chrysler in the city of Detroit bid on a Saturn missile contract. They did not receive the contract. When Michigan Representatives inquired from Dr. Glennan, the head of NASA, as to how the contract had been placed, we learned that one of the things done in placing such a contract is to set up a committee of expert scientists to determine whether or not the companies bidding have the technical competence to perform the contract. We were told that this committee on the Saturn contract placed Chrysler sixth among the bidders. In view of the fact that our first satellite put in orbit was made largely by Chrysler, this came as a distinct shock to those of us from Michigan.

In view of the fact that there are only a few scientists in the United States who are competent in space projects, such scientists are of necessity advisers both to industry and to the Government.

Without suggesting that such a thing was true in the placement of the Saturn contract, the method of placement raises the questions of first, whether or not there exists an inherent conflict of interests on the part of the scientists in such placement, or second, whether or not the scientists are to some extent being used as fronts behind which the Department of Defense places contracts as it chooses.

On May 5, the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, chaired by HOLIFIELD, of California, and of which I am a member, inquired into conflicts of interest. I would like to place in the RECORD at this point some of the information brought forth in that committee:

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask a question. When do you consider a conflict of interest of such degree that those involved are unemployable?

Mr. STEPLER (from the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Defense). That is a good question; you mean setting aside statutes which are on the books? As a matter of ethics and morality?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. No, right under the statutes.

Mr. STEPLER. Under the statutes? Well, you start with an ethical principle that man cannot serve two masters.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. All right.

Mr. STEPLER. If the man is a full-time Government employee, he is subject to certain restrictions in his work and he is also by law subject to certain restrictions after he leaves work for a period of time. This

differs with civilians as it does with retired officers. They have different restrictions on them.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Well, in my personal opinion, we have entered a new era. We have arrived at a place where we need people skilled in a very specific field, and these people are being hired by industry as consultants, they are also used by the Government as consultants on occasion. Now, I think a new conflict of interest situation has arisen. This is just my judgment. It is perfectly obvious that if you are the consultant, today, to a vast industry and you receive a really good fee for it, and tomorrow you are the consultant to the Government and you are determining the specifications for a purchase, even up to the point as to which companies are capable of doing it, that you have a possibility of a conflict of interest. I think the Government has arrived at a very difficult position.

Maybe those people who are hired as those consultants can be objective, but I doubt it. We are turning over the spending of \$40 billion to a very small and select group of people. And I think while they may be excellent in science, they are subject to the same type of prejudices that other people are subject to. And they hand these contracts out to their friends. Now, that is just all there is to it.

I had an interesting opportunity to talk with a man who was one of the first employees of a firm that dealt exclusively for a long period of time with the Government, and he told me the one thing he never understood about that firm was the consultants that they had. They would bring topflight scientists into the business. It was in a very pleasant area of the country. They would spend long vacations there and he said, "As far as I know, they never did anything." They really didn't do any work, but they were paid astronomical fees. The Government paid them, of course.

Then these consultants went back into the Government and set up a set of specifications, really, that only a few people could meet, only a small part of industry. Now I think this presents a real problem. I think the power of government purchasing today is one of the biggest factors that this economy has to deal with, and I think it is being more and more restricted to only a few concerns in a few areas of the country.

I think one of the problems with it is this consultant business in the Government. I think this is one of the questions that the Government has to answer, and I think it is a real tough question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It poses the problem of requiring consultants who sit on one side of the table to restrict their consultative clients to the Government, for instance, if they are working for the Government.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I agree.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And a general consultant, as Mrs. GRIFFITHS points out, who is paid a fee of \$10,000 as a consultant's fee for electronics company X one day, who has a new device, and 3 weeks later he is called into the Defense Department on a \$50-a-day basis, \$56-a-day basis, to advise them on what kind of electronics for a certain purpose they should purchase.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. He is in a perfect position to let us say, justify the \$10,000 fee which he was paid the previous week or so.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I mean he could be above reproach and yet he is human. He thinks in terms of what equipment did that particular concern have and what kind of management did they have. They are his friends. I think you have to arrive at the place where you consider this a conflict of interest.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. May I ask you, if the Defense Department required every bidder to supply the names and the salary paid to all consultative experts over a period of a year or 2 years preceding the bid and required every consultant they employed to list their employers for the last year, do you think that would help some in determining whether there has been a conflict of interest or not?

Mr. STEPLER. I really don't think so, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, for this reason: When we pick a consultant, by "we" I mean when the person or people concerned decide they want Jones to help them on this matter, I assume they know Jones—what work he does, who he does work for, and I hope if Jones is an automotive engineer, a consultant to General Motors, they don't get Jones as a consultant to draw up specifications for procurement of a new truck. I hope they take this into account in what they are doing.

What you mentioned before could conceivably take place, but I would hope in prudent administration you would be reasonable in your selection of consultants, where, as a captive consultant, why, you would not use him in the situation where the results of the work they are doing, even though advisory, could come to pass to the benefit of the companies he consulted with on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I think it would relieve the minds of a lot of people, though, if they could see this in writing, see who these consultants have been. I think it would be helpful, myself.

I am happy to say that there is some concern over this problem in the scientific world and in a late May issue of Science, the publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, there is the following report:

SCIENCE IN THE NEWS—SCIENTISTS IN GOVERNMENT—GROWING CONCERN OVER CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There is considerable and growing concern over the position of scientists with regard to the conflict-of-interest laws. The subject is talked of a good deal in private but only rarely in public, a situation which reflects the delicacy with which it is felt this potentially explosive issue must be handled.

The relevant laws are a group of seven poorly defined, vaguely interpreted statutes which, in their broadest interpretation, prohibit anyone working for the Government from having a financial interest in any group having dealings with the Government. They tend to put almost anyone working for the Government on less than a career civil service basis in an extremely awkward position. The situation is difficult for administrative and legal personnel, often preventing the Government from obtaining the services of an outstanding man because of the unreasonable financial sacrifices he would have to make in order to protect himself from a possible accusation of violating the law. But nowhere is the situation more touchy than in the case of scientific personnel.

The Government today relies on an intricate web of consultancies, contracts, and part-time and temporary employees to provide itself with the scientific and technical assistance it must have. It underwrites more than half the scientific research done in this country. It "employs" in some fashion a very large fraction of the leading scientists in the country, and a question of conflict of interest could be raised in almost every case. The institution or corporation with which the scientist is associated very probably is receiving a share of the more than \$5 billion the Government spends annually on scientific work. Quite often it